
REMARKS

The applicant has amended the claims as set out above and provides remarks set out below to address each concern raised by the office in the official communication mailed June 18, 2003. Amendments to the claims have been made to comply with examiner concerns and to refine claim language. The amendments are believed to be consistent with the disclosure originally filed. The amendments have also been particularly presented to avoid, where applicable, any admission or estoppel, generally, negatively affecting the scope of protection provided by the disclosure and claims of the present application, and particularly to avoid prosecution history estoppel, limitation of the scope of equivalences, or the like.

Additional claims

The applicant has amended the specification to include newly added claims 111-137 without the addition of any new matter.

Rejoinder

Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder of claims 97 and 99-110 to the elected invention. In accordance with the examiner's suggestions, applicant has amended, without prejudice, independent claim 97 to include the limitations of the apparatus claim 83.

35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph concerns

The applicant believing independent claim 83 is in a condition for allowance, as discussed below, respectfully requests the office to reconsider allowance of claim 94 which is ultimately dependent upon independent claim 83.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) concerns

Claims 83-86, 89, 91-92, and 94-96 were questioned under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) citing Hollinger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,515,274). Independent claim 83 has been amended to include, *inter alia*, "wherein said inner surfaces of said nozzle body and said nozzle tip are substantially

continuous". As now clarified, by substantially continuous, it is meant that there is no significant displacement at the interface of the inner surfaces of the nozzle body and nozzle tip.

Applicant has added new independent claims 111 and 125 that include, *inter alia*, "a continuously converging nozzle tip." Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the newly added independent claims as well as their dependencies, as discussed in an interview on October 29, 2003.

With respect to the art on record as discussed in the interview, it is understood that the art of record does not make obvious the claims as now submitted. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 83 and the claims ultimately made dependent thereon as well as consideration of independent claim 111 along with corresponding method claims 97 and 125 and the claims ultimately made dependent thereon.

It is noted that the office has given certain reasons for allowance of the application. It is noted, however, that it is the claims as a whole and not just the summary provided by the examiner, which makes the claims allowable.

Because the additional prior art cited by the examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

The applicant having addressed each of the office's concerns raised in the office action, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims as amended.

Dated this 7th day of November, 2003.

Respectfully Submitted,
SANTANGELO Law Offices, P.C.

By: Nicole A. Ressue
Nicole A. Ressue
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT
PTO No. 48,665
125 South Howes, Third Floor
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
(970) 224-3100

Page 17 of 17